

## REMARKS

Claims 1-62 are pending, with claims 1, 12, 23, 36, 50, 54, 58, and 62 being independent. Claims 54-61 are withdrawn. Claim 1 and 12 are amended and claim 62 is newly added by virtue of this amendment. No new matter has been introduced

Claims 23-53 are allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing these claims, and for acknowledging acceptance of the drawings filed with the present application.

Claims 1-11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of co-pending U.S. Application No. 09/931,061 (the '061 application). Claims 12-22 also are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over claims 11-20 of the '061 application. Claims 23-35 also are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over claims 21-32 of the '061 application. Finally, claims 36-49 also are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over claims 33-45 of the '061 application. Applicant requests that these provisional double-patenting rejections continue to be held in abeyance and re-evaluated upon allowance and issue of the '061 application.

Claims 1, 4, 9-12, 15, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,386 to Perner (Perner) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,432,610 to Kobayashi (Kobayashi). Claims 2, 5, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner in view of Kobayashi, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,699,078 to Yamazaki et al. (Yamazaki '078). Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner in view of Kobayashi, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,349,366 to Yamazaki et al. (Yamazaki '366). Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner in view of Kobayashi, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,471,225 to Parks (Parks). Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner in view of Kobayashi and Parks, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,945,866 to Fonash et al. (Fonash). Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner in view of Kobayashi and Parks, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,752,118 to Johnson et al. (Johnson).

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 4, 9-12, 15 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner in view of Kobayashi, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination does not disclose or suggest all of the features recited in at least independent claims 1 and 12, as amended. For example, claims 1 and 12 recite a plurality of (or "n") first, second, third, and fourth switches having features as recited in those claims, as well as a liquid crystal element having features as recited therein. Support for these amendments to claims 1 and 12 may be found, for example, at page 17, lines 4-10 of the present application, as well as in FIG. 1 of the present application.

Applicant submits that neither Perner nor Kobayashi, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or fairly suggests at least these features. As a result, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 12 are allowable for at least these reasons, so that dependent claims 2-11 and 13-22 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Similarly, new claim 62 recites:

A liquid crystal display device having a pixel having:  
a liquid crystal element; and  
a plurality of sub-pixels, each of the plurality of sub-pixels  
comprising:  
a memory circuit;  
a non-volatile memory circuit;  
a first switch electrically connected to the memory circuit;  
a second switch electrically connected to the first switch  
and to the non-volatile memory circuit;  
a third switch electrically connected to the liquid crystal  
element and to the memory circuit; and  
a fourth switch electrically connected to the liquid crystal  
element and to the non-volatile memory circuit.

Applicant submits that neither Perner nor Kobayashi, nor any of the prior art of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or fairly suggests at least these features. As a result, Applicant submits that independent claim 62 in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Jun Koyama et al.  
Serial No. : 09/930,956  
Filed : August 17, 2001  
Page : 18 of 18

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-071001 / US5156

Since claims 23-53 have been allowed, and claims 1-22 and 62 are in condition for allowance for the reasons just described (and claims 54-61 are withdrawn), Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is requested in the Examiner's next official communication.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$984.00 (including \$104.00 for excess claim fees, \$110.00 for the One-Month Extension of Time fee, and \$770 for the RCE fee). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*August 17, 2004*



William G. Hughes, Jr.  
Reg. No. 46,112

**Customer No. 26171**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331  
WXH/ad  
c26c9944.doc